

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/765,591	PALAZZINI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Sarang Afzali	3726	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sarang Afzali. (3)\_\_\_\_\_

(2) John Carlson. (4)\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 7/17/07 & 7/19/07.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Butter (US 3,678,802).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



DAVID P. BRYANT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant representative, Mr. Carlson called to discuss about claim 1 in particular the limitation of "simultaneously machining a floor and opposite interior wall surfaces of the cavities along a plurality of elongated cavity paths." Both the Examiner and Mr. Carlson agreed that although Butter discloses a general teaching of machining a continuous cavity along an elongated path, however it teaches that the simultaneous machining of the floor and opposite interior wall surfaces of the cavity is done in only a portion of the path while the rest of the path is done in multiple passes that does not include the simultaneous machining of all three surfaces. Therefore, the Examiner agreed that the claimed invention is defined over the prior art of record and therefore the case is allowed. In addition, the Examiner will amend claim 15 to include that the floor and opposite interior wall surfaces are simultaneously machined" to overcome the art of record. As for the rest of the independent claims 12, 13 and 14, the Applicant has amended the allowable subject matter into independent forms to define over the prior art of record.